



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,663	10/10/2001	Kun-Tsang Kuo	67,200-465	2709

7590                    09/23/2003

TUNG & ASSOCIATES  
Suite 120  
838 W. Long Lake Road  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ANDERSON, GERALD A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/975,663	KUO, KUN-TSANG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JERRY A ANDERSON	3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10,11,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10, 11, 13, 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 26 June 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that only the shelves and the defector 56 are metal. The Examiner can find no base for the applicant's assertion that "only" the shelves and the defector 56 are metal. There is no disclosure that the system of Farrell is constructed from anything but metal. As stated in column 4 lines 6-8: metal shelving is typically used in commercial mobile storage systems. In this context "metal shelving" refers to the entire mobile storage system as being metal and not just the shelves. The applicant asks why it is inherent that the metal shelving system be grounded. This is because this is a system that supports electrical equipment and it is required by the Nat. Electrical Code that all electrical systems and equipment be properly grounded. Note for example that Farrell intends to mount electric motors to each mobile shelving unit, see column 11 lines 25-32 therefore it follows that the shelving units be grounded. The applicant argues that the claims are limited to "cells on shelves of the racks". Actually what is claimed is "racks comprises shelves with a plurality of cells" which the Examiner takes to mean that the shelves are sub-divided into cells? This is shown by Farrell in which the shelves 16 are divided by the partitions 18 to form cells.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the structure that supports the applicant assertion that the "rack are electrically grounded" and that the cells are "electrically connected to the racks" is a positive limitation. What grounds the rack? What connects the cells to the racks?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Farrell et al. Farrell is cited showing a double-sided rack system having tracks 22 supporting storage units 32 with shelves 16 and partitions 18 to form cells and a drive mechanism, see col. 5, lines 48-50. Farrell discloses that commercial mobile storage systems are typically made from metal. It is inherent that a metal shelving system would be grounded. The recitation of a newly discovered function or property inherently possessed by things in the prior art does not cause a claim drawn to these things to distinguish over the prior art. The PTO may require the applicant to prove that the prior art does not possess the characteristics relied on. In re Swinehart and Sfiligoj 169 USPQ 226 (1971).

***Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Spitzer et al. Farrell fails to show sloped shelves. Spitzer is cited disclosing a mobile rack shelves 125 sloped to prevent cargo spillage. The angle of the shelves is considered an obvious matter of design choice for one having an ordinary skill in the art. Since the references are from the same field of endeavor the purpose of Spitzer would have been obvious in the pertinent art of Farrell at the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Farrell with shelves sloped to prevent cargo spillage in view of Spitzer.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Anderson whose telephone number is 703 038 2202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703 308 24668. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3597 for regular communications and 703 306 4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 2197.

Jaa  
September 17, 2003

LANNA MAI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

